

## **Draft Minutes from the July 8, 1995 Meeting**

The Fernald Citizens Task Force met from 8:35 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. on July 8, 1995 at the Joint Information Center, 6025 Dixie Highway, Fairfield, Ohio. The meeting was advertised in local papers and open to the public. Time was reserved for public input.

Members Present:	John Applegate Jim Bierer Marvin Clawson Lisa Crawford Jack Craig, DOE (for J. Phillip Hamric) Pam Dunn Constance Fox Guy Guckenberger Laura Hegge, OEPA (for Graham Mitchell) Darryl Huff Gene Jablonowski, EPA Thomas Rentschler Warren Strunk Thomas Wagner Gene Willeke
Members Absent:	Jerry Monahan Robert Tabor
Designated Federal Official Present:	Ken Morgan, DOE
Task Force Staff Present:	Judy Armstrong Tina Krueger Douglas Sarno Ruth Triplett

About thirty spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public and representatives from FRESH, DOE, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, the Battelle/PNL, University of Cincinnati, Greater Cincinnati Building & Construction Trades Council, FERMCO, and other interested parties.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Chair John Applegate called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. and asked for approval of the draft meeting minutes of the June 10, 1995 meeting.

Pam Dunn requested that the minutes reflect that the Task Force is not amenable to the ordinary procedure of transferring unclaimed American Indian remains and artifacts to museums. Dunn's amendment was acknowledged and the minutes were approved.

2. Introduction

Applegate introduced Judith Bradbury from Battelle Laboratories/PNL in Washington, D.C. Ms. Bradbury is a member of the Site Specific Advisory Board Performance Evaluation Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is developing a framework for SSAB evaluation. Ms. Bradbury will meet with several Task Force members and obtain perspectives to assist in the development of SSAB performance standards.

3. Discussion on Radium

Applegate then turned the floor over to Jack Craig, Director of the DOE Fernald Area Office, who discussed with the Task Force the July 2, 1995 *Cincinnati Enquirer* article regarding a May 11, 1995, technology meeting on radium and precious metal extraction from the K-65 residue.

Craig first introduced Bob Folker, Deputy Manager of the DOE Ohio Field Office, and Mike Skriba, FERMCO Operable Unit 4 Director. Craig then explained that radium extraction had been evaluated as part of the Operable Unit 4 Feasibility Study and found to be too expensive to be the preferred alternative. At that meeting and through the ROD process vitrification has been the preferred remedy. Skriba stated that the ROD can be changed, but that DOE does not support reopening the ROD at this time.

Skriba discussed the "Radium and Precious Metal Extraction in K65 Residues" handout. Skriba stated that the May 11, 1995 meeting was one in a series of technology meetings in which technical experts shared information and discussed removal alternatives. Skriba also stated that the meeting was not "secret" as implied in the July 2, 1995 newspaper article, but that these information gathering meetings are not generally announced to the general public. Attendants of the May 11 meeting included representatives from the Sloan Kettering Institute, Pacific Northwest Labs, Nevada University, DOE EM50, Fernald CRU 4, Cincinnati chapter of the Cancer Society, physicians from the University of Cincinnati.

Lisa Crawford asked why the medical community has placed focus on the K65 vitrification at Fernald. Skriba responded that the radium is beneficial to cancer research and Fernald is currently the largest concentrated source in the U.S. The medical community is concerned about the diminishing sources of radium. After vitrification, the radium will be harder to access. Skriba emphasized that the goal of DOE to reduce risk at Fernald is different from the medical community's goal of securing a radium source. Recent advances have made the issue more important today than it was a year ago, when addressed in the ROD.

In response to precious metals concerns, Skriba stated that the retrievable gold would still be radioactive and therefore the street value would be virtually zero.

Applegate stated that the May meeting was for information gathering, not decision making, and the meeting has now been misinterpreted in the media. Task Force members suggested that information regarding technological meetings should be more accessible. Craig stated that

addressing the issue of how to better share information will be an immediate priority for Fernald management. Crawford stated that she would like to see a technology working group formed that would distribute a meeting schedule.

#### 4. Discussion of Recommendations Report

Applegate then turned to final approval of the Task Force recommendations. He asked for title suggestions, as the "Final Report" title would be inaccurate if the Task Force is not ending. The title, "Recommendations on Remediation Levels, Waste Disposition, Priorities, and Future Use," was adopted.

A suggestion was made that the discussion of water supply be more accurately written. Restated that the text on page 9 be incorporated into a figure for the appendix because it is redundant with the narrative material. Ken Morgan raised a concern that the reference to the Keystone Report reflects a false dependence on the report. He thought that the Fernald SSAB addressed issues beyond those addressed in the Keystone Report.

A request was made for clarification that the Task Force used the "uranium envelope" to focus its evaluation and recommendations because to remediate uranium to safe levels would result in the remediation of almost all other contaminants to safe levels as well. Any exceptions would also be remediated to safe levels. It was noted that DOE is responsible to remediate all contaminants to their respective MCLs and that this fact should be noted in the final report.

A member of the audience, Joe Krombe, asked how the MCLs in the report were reached. Marc Jewett of FERMCO CRU 5 explained that background concentration for uranium in groundwater is 1 ppb and a the concentration of uranium to achieve a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  risk level is 1.5 to 1.8 ppb. Combining these two numbers achieves the MCL, thus the MCL is 2.8 ppb, or approximately 3 ppb which is the number used at  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . At a risk of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ , the uranium concentration would be 18 ppb. By adding the 1 ppb for existing background we get 19 ppb, or approximately 20 ppb which is the MCL being used at Fernald.

The Task Force then discussed the difference of the wording "MCL" or "20 ppb for uranium" on page 28. Some members believe that the current MCL is a proposed value and is likely to change as new regulations are developed. These members did not believe it was wise to be committed to a fixed number under these circumstances. A suggestion was made to state that currently the Task Force is proposing the statutory limit of 20 ppb, but that technological changes may influence that number. Gene Jablonowski suggested that using a specific number implied a level of technological evaluation that the Task Force is not qualified to make, and requested that the wording remain focused on the acceptable level of risk. A member of the audience commented that the interim report included a discussion of risk levels in the appendix which, based on the discussion, would be good to include.

A motion was then made by Crawford and seconded to approve the report as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

It was agreed that the final report would be formally submitted to DOE on August 1, 1995.

#### 5. Discussion of Upcoming Activities

John Applegate reminded members that a media event was planned for August 1, 1995 at 4:00 p.m. at the Meadowbrook in Ross, Ohio, to officially release the report. All members were encouraged to attend. John Applegate also confirmed that the next meeting of the Task Force would be held on September 30, 1995, at 8:30 a.m., at the Joint Information Center in Fairfield.

6. Opportunity for Public Input

John Applegate asked the members of the audience if there were any other comments or issues in addition to those that were raised by members of the audience during Task Force deliberations. There were none.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.